



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,034	11/28/2001	Jens Grieswald	7123 US	1255
30078	7590	10/02/2007	EXAMINER	
MATTHEW D. RABDAU			HOM, SHICK C	
TEKTRONIX, INC.				
14150 S.W. KARL BRAUN DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
P.O. BOX 500 (50-LAW)				
BEAVERTON, OR 97077-0001		2616		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/997,034	GRIESWALD, JENS
Examiner	Art Unit	
Shick C. Hom	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/9/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In page 2 of the remarks, applicant argued that because Parker in Figs. 6-9 teaches the packet shell generating facility PSGF, which corresponds to the test apparatus, communicates directly only with "virtual layers," and not with "any layer" that the communication system being subdivided into that Parker does not suggest or teach a port that allows communication by a test apparatus directly with any layer is not persuasive because a layer being virtual merely mean that the layer is shared, i.e. not dedicated, (see Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary, 1994) hence any layer would be a virtual layer since the purpose of layering is to allow each layer to perform a specific task such as the data link layer which is concerned with the transmission of frames of data between devices aimed at packaging raw data characters into frames, detecting and correcting errors whereby this layer is clearly shared between devices. Accordingly claims 1 and 6 is clearly anticipated by Parker.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3 and 6-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parker (5,822,520).

Regarding claims 1 and 6:

Parker disclose a circuit for testing a communication system that is subdivided into functional layers comprises a port that allows communication by a test apparatus directly with any layer that is higher than a first layer of the functional layers without the communication previously having to pass through the first layer (the abstract recite the packet shell generation facility PSGF generating test packets for testing network protocol device; and Figs. 6-9 show the test circuit, i.e. PSGF, whereby the circuit is communicating directly with any layer without communicating through the first layer as claimed).

Regarding claim 2:

Art Unit: 2616

Parker disclose wherein the functional layers correspond to an OSI reference model (col. 1 lines 43-64 recite the use of the OSI reference model).

Regarding claim 3:

Parker disclose wherein the communication comprises data input into and/or data output from the port (Fig. 9 shows and col. 5 line 66 to col. 6 line 8 recite that each layers being in bidirectional communication with the kernel of the local computer).

Regarding claims 7-10:

Parker disclose the step of inputting test data which is a stimulation signal, into the port before the outputting step; and wherein the response data, is a monitoring signal, comprise a response to the stimulation signal (col. 2 lines 47-65 recite test packet being generated to simulate the network communication reads on the stimulation signal and col. 9 lines 46-56 recite the effect of the test packets being monitored and evaluated so that the effects of the specific layers can be evaluated reads on the output of the response data).

Art Unit: 2616

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker (5,822,520) in view of Warren (6,381,721).

Regarding claims 4 and 5:

For claims 4 and 5, Parker discloses the circuit arrangement described in paragraph 3 of this office action. For claims 4 and 5, Parker discloses all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of wherein the processing of the communication is realized on a single chip, with the port being provided on the chip as recited in claim 4 and wherein the processing of the communication is realized on a first chip and the port on a second chip, the first and second chips being linked with each other for data transfer as recited in claim 5.

Warren from the same or similar fields of endeavor teach that it is known to provide the processing of the communication

Art Unit: 2616

is realized on a single chip, with the port being provided on the chip (see col. 1 lines 55-67) and wherein the processing of the communication is realized on a first chip and the port on a second chip, the first and second chips being linked with each other for data transfer (see col. 3 line 43 to col. 4 line 16 and the first and second chip in claim 9).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the processing of the communication being realized on a single chip, with the port being provided on the chip and the processing of the communication being realized on a first chip and the port on a second chip, the first and second chips being linked with each other for data transfer as taught by Warren in the circuit arrangement of Parker.

The motivation for providing the processing of the communication being realized on a single chip, with the port being provided on the chip and the processing of the communication being realized on a first chip and the port on a second chip, the first and second chips being linked with each other for data transfer as taught by Warren in the circuit arrangement of Parker being that it provides the desirable added feature of integrated circuit technology to the circuit arrangement of Parker.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shick C. Hom whose telephone number is 571-272-3173. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pham Chi can be reached on 571-272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization

Art Unit: 2616

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SH
SH.


CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
9/27/07